

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION THREE

In re C.P., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

C.P.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A125389

(Contra Costa County
Super. Ct. No. J0700722)

C.P., a minor, appeals from a dispositional order of the juvenile court. His counsel has filed a brief seeking our independent review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 to determine whether there are any arguable issues that should be addressed on appeal. We find there are none, and affirm.

BACKGROUND

Fifteen-year-old C.P. was declared a ward by the juvenile court in 2007 after the court found he committed a single count of misdemeanor battery arising from a fight on school grounds. C.P. was placed on probation with various conditions and returned to his mother's home.

He violated the terms of his probation a number of times. Most involved his use of marijuana, but some were based on incidents when C.P. left home without permission and exhibited violent or out of control behavior towards his mother. C.P. was continued on probation after each violation, subject to additional restrictions such as counseling,

drug testing and juvenile electronic monitoring. In March 2009, he was diagnosed with bipolar mood disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and conduct disorder.

In April 2009, a probation violation petition alleged that C.P. left home without permission and his whereabouts were unknown. C.P. admitted that he violated probation. The juvenile court found that C.P.'s welfare required that he be removed from his mother's custody and he was ordered to out-of-home placement. C.P. filed this timely appeal.

DISCUSSION

Defense counsel represents that she advised C.P. of his right to submit supplemental written argument on his own behalf and to request that counsel be relieved. He has not done so. This court has reviewed the entire record on appeal. There are no legal issues that require further briefing.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

Siggins, J.

We concur:

McGuinness, P.J.

Pollak, J.